UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,265	04/24/2001	Jeff Reynar	60001.0049US01/MS#154685.	6007

27488 7590 12/24/2008

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
SPOONER, LAMONT M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/841,265	REYNAR, JEFF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LAMONT M. SPOONER	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,10 and 14-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,10 and 14-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/11/08, 10/29/08 and 11/19 08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. This office action is in response to applicant's claims filed 10/14/08. Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 14-25 are currently pending and have been examined. Applicant's IDS filed 7/11/08, 10/29/08 and 11/19 08 and have been considered. There is no claim to foreign priority.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the newly added limitations, (all arguments from p.10-12, regarding "wherein at least one of the plurality of grammars comprises a union of data from a plurality of user data sources", referring to claims 1, 20 and 21 and the dependent claims therein) to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4,6, and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-7, 9, 10, 15-17, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakita (US Patent No. 5,956,681) in view of Szabo (US 6,868,525), and further in view of Butler et al. (US 7,082,392), and further in view of Haley (US 6,950,831, and further in view of Fortescue et al. (Fortescue, US 6,975,983).

As per **claim 1**, Yamakita discloses a computer system for applying mode bias to an input field of an electronic document of an application, the system comprising:

a schema registry in communication with the application (Fig. 10-registration table, Fig. 1 item 108, C.16.lines 22-28-application, C.35.lines 62-64); and

wherein the schema registry comprises a schema database (C.35.lines 12, 13-schema registry/database) and a grammar database (C.35.lines 23-31-the grammar database format type field dictionary-acceptable input in units of format types), wherein the schema database comprises a plurality of schema names (Fig. 10- “format type” database-is interpreted as the schema database comprising a plurality of schema names, i.e., “e-mail”, “destination number”, “text”, “address”, “schedule”,

C.35.lines 62-64) and a plurality of pointers to grammars associated with the plurality of schema names (C.33.line 60-C.34.line 16, C.35.lines 25-31-format type registration table points to the format type field dictionary, which in turn searches the recognized data for field specific units corresponding and registered as a keyword for the field) and wherein the pointers point to the grammar database comprising a plurality of grammars (ibid, C.35.lines 43-64-his format type field generation as for dynamically generating one or more grammars, and the format type/schema name is located in the schema registry-Fig. 10, which points to code for “E-mail”, C.9.lines 49-53-his control program, and C.35.lines 62-64-his coping with various schema, ibid, wherein the grammar defines input such as Email related input for the field, Fax, destination number, formats the text with respect to the field for the information to be entered as a form of grammar, C.35 lines-21-30, 43-67- C.36 lines 1-5-his format type dictionary as the schema database comprising schema names, "address", "schedule", etc, his grammar database defining acceptable input into the fields, ibid, C.35 lines 11-20-his format types, stored in the registration table);

an input engine in communication with the schema registry (Fig. 1 item 101-the mobile terminal comprising the input engine is connected to

the schema registry, Fig. 10-the registration table, located within Fig. 1 item 108), wherein the schema registry is configured to:

receive a schema name from the application (C.5.lines 45-67-"destination number", "text", "e-mail"), locate a grammar from among the plurality of grammars comprising one of: a regular expression and a statistical language model (C.35 line 11-C.37 line 36-his explicitly defined grammar and description of a text string for his appropriate field as his regular expression, wherein the grammar defines, for a speech input, numbers and format for a Fax field, for example), the grammar being associated with the schema name and sends the grammar to the input engine (C.5.lines 55, 56-formatted text generation section determines acceptable grammar associated with the schema name, "destination number", which is sent to the input engine, C.6.lines 7-19, C.35.lines 62-64)

wherein the grammar defines an appropriate input for the input field, and wherein the schema in the schema registry is associated with a corresponding grammar by one of: referring to the grammar directly (C.5.lines 55, 56-formatted text generation section determines acceptable grammar associated with the schema name, "destination number" directly),

but lacks explicitly teaching the schema registry as a hierarchical based schema registry, and a hierarchical analysis to the input field.

However, Szabo teaches having a hierarchical schema registry (C.21.lines 33-56) and hierarchical analysis to the input field (ibid, Fig. 1A). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Yamakita by having a hierarchical schema registry. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an organization of query responses (C.21.lines 46, 47).

Yamakita with Szabo fail to explicitly disclose, a grammar having a language setting, a locale setting. However, Butler teaches a grammar having a language setting, and a locale setting (C.7.lines 62-67). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Szabo with Yamakita's registry with a grammar having a language setting, and a locale setting, providing the benefit of having an entry text specific to a language and locale for use by a speech recognition and text field formatting entry (Butler, C.5 lines 50, 51, C.8 lines 7, 8).

The above combination lacks teaching the schema registry as a mark-up language schema registry. However, Haley teaches having a

mark-up language schema registry (Fig. 4, his binding table, C.6-line 39-C.7 line 64-his data item as XSL). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Szabo and Butler, and Yamakita with Haley, providing the benefit of an document syntax registry, such as the well known XML registry, wherein XML (XSL, XQL) is a well known mark-up language which provides data structuring rules.

The above combinations lack teaching wherein at least one of the plurality of grammars comprises a union of data from a plurality of user data sources. However, Fortescue teaches wherein at least one of the plurality of grammars comprises a union of data from a plurality of user data sources (C.8 lines 6-15-his "fax (this & mouse!click) to (him & mouse!click)-wherein his fax rules include a grammar, and the grammar comprises a union of data from a speech source and mouse source).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Szabo and Butler, Haley and Yamakita with Fortescue, providing the benefit of having a multimodal rule/grammar defining user input from more than one user data source (Fortescue, C.7 line 67-C.8 line 5).

As per **claims 2, 3, and 5**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claims 2, 3 and 5 depend. Yamakita further discloses:

the input engine is a speech recognition engine (C.1.lines 33-67).

the input engine is a handwriting recognition engine (ibid).

the input engine is keypad of a cellphone (ibid).

As per **claims 4, 6, and 7**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claims 4, 6, and 7 depend. However, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler and Haley lack explicitly disclosing:

the input engine is an input method editor;

the input engine is gesture-based input method;

the input engine is a *sign language recognition engine;

However Fortescue teaches having an input method editor, gesture based input method, and a sign language recognition engine (C.16 lines 28-50-his distributed input processor module as the input method editor and his gesture and sign input modalities).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the combination of Szabo, Butler, Haley and Yamakita with

Fortescue's multiple input engines, and recognition of these input methods. The motivation for doing so would have been to have multiple forms of input which would provide the obvious benefit of expanded input methods, for example to accommodate disabled persons.

As per **claim 9**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

the grammar is a context free grammar (C.33.lines 60-65-clause dependent grammar).

As per **claim 10**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

the grammar is a context sensitive grammar (C.33.lines 66, 67, C.34.line 1).

As per **claim 15**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 15 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

the input engine uses the grammar to receive input from a user of the application (C.36.lines 33-36-the input engine uses the grammar rule defining acceptable text to receive input, C.35.lines 35-37, from the user).

As per **claim 16**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

the input engine further uses the grammar to bias the user's input toward a correct input for the input field (C.36.lines 1-36-correct input comprising and email address, biased by format and unnecessary word deletion).

As per **claim 17**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 17 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

the input engine compares the input of the user (C.35.lines 35-37) to the grammar (C.35.lines 22-31, 43-51-comparative step) to determine whether the input matches and is an appropriate input (C.36.lines 20-36).

As per **claim 19**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 19 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

the schema registry is in communication with the application through a text service framework (Fig. 1 item 108, 101-C.1.line 63-C.2.line 8-stochastic input text interfaced with mobile terminal), but lacks the schema registry as a mark-up language schema registry.

Yamakita, Szabo, Butler and Fortescue lack teaching the schema registry as a mark-up language schema registry. However, Haley teaches having a mark-up language schema registry (Fig. 4, his binding table, C.6-line 39-C.7 line 64-his data item as XSL). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Szabo and Butler, Fortescue and Yamakita with Haley, providing the benefit of an document syntax registry, such as the well known XML registry, wherein XML (XSL, XQL) is a well known mark-up language which provides data structuring rules.

As per **claim 21**, Yamakita discloses a computer-implemented method for applying mode bias to an input field of an electronic document of an application program module, the method comprising the steps of:

determining that an insertion point is within the input field (C.36.lines 34, 35-inherent for insertion into an appropriate field);

determining a mode bias schema that is attached to the input field (C.35.lines 11-31-format type name registry, C.36.lines 20-36),

dynamically generating a plurality of grammars based on the input field and a schema registry wherein the plurality of grammars define an appropriate input for the input field and is associated with a schema name (C.35.lines 43-64-his format type field generation as for dynamically generating one or more grammars, and the format type/schema name is located in the schema registry-Fig. 10, which points to code for “E-mail”, C.9.lines 49-53-his control program, and C.35.lines 62-64-his coping with various schema, ibid, wherein the grammar defines input such as Email related input for the field, Fax, destination number, formats the text with respect to the field for the information to be entered as a form of grammar), and wherein each of the plurality of the grammars comprise one of: a regular expression and a statistical model (C.35 line 11-C.37 line 36-his explicitly defined grammar and description of a text string for his appropriate field as his regular expression, wherein the grammar defines, for a speech input, numbers and format for a Fax field, for example);

determining a grammar from the generated plurality of grammars that is associated with the mode bias schema (C.35.lines 15-65-format type field dictionary, grammar rule determined by “email, fax, etc."); and

sending the grammar associated with the mode bias schema to an input engine wherein the input engine uses the grammar associated with the mode bias schema to receive input for the input field (C.5.lines 55, 56-formatted text generation section determines acceptable grammar associated with the schema name, “destination number”, which is sent to the input engine, C.6.lines 7-19, C.35.lines 62-64).

Yamakita lack teaching a ranked list of mode bias schemas.

However, Szabo teaches having a ranked list of mode bias schemas (his hierarchical schema registry, C.21.lines 33-56, Fig. 1A his input and hierarchy, wherein the ranking is interpreted as the node levels of the hierarchy). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Yamakita’s mode bias with Szabo’s ranked list of mode bias schemas for determining a mode bias schema providing an organization of query responses as per hierarchical mode bias (Szabo, C.21.lines 46, 47).

Yamakita with Szabo fail to explicitly disclose, a grammar having a language setting, a locale setting. However, Butler teaches a grammar having a language setting, and a locale setting (C.7.lines 62-67). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Szabo with Yamakita's registry with a grammar having a language setting, and a locale setting, providing the benefit of having an entry text specific to a language and locale for use by a speech recognition and text field formatting entry (Butler, C.5 lines 50, 51, C.8 lines 7, 8).

Yamakita with Szabo and Butler lack teaching the schema registry as a mark-up language schema registry. However, Haley teaches having a mark-up language schema registry (Fig. 4, his binding table, C.6-line 39-C.7 line 64-his data item as XSL). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Yamakita, Szabo and Butler with Haley, providing the benefit of an document syntax registry, such as the well known XML registry, wherein XML (XSL, XQL) is a well known mark-up language which provides data structuring rules.

The above combinations lack teaching wherein dynamically generating at least one of the plurality of grammars comprises collecting data from a plurality of user data sources. However, Fortescue teaches dynamically generating at least one of the plurality of grammars comprises collecting data from a plurality of user data sources (C.8 lines 6-15-his "fax (this & mouse!click) to (him & mouse!click)-wherein his fax rules include a grammar, and the grammar comprises a union of data from a speech source and mouse source).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Szabo and Butler, Haley and Yamakita with Fortescue, providing the benefit of having a multimodal rule/grammar defining user input from more than one user data source (Fortescue, C.7 line 67-C.8 line 5).

As per **claim 22**, Yamakita, Haley, Butler, Szabo and Fortescue, make obvious all of the limitations of claim 21, upon which claim 22 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

receiving text at the insertion point (C.36.lines 20-36-predetermined field is the insertion point) and determining whether the received text (C.35.lines 32-47-received text) matches an input type defined by the

grammar (C.36.lines 20-30-determination that the grammar matches an email grammar) and, if so, then displaying the text in the input field (C.36.lines 33-36, C.6.lines 16-18).

As per **claim 24**, Yamakita, Haley, Butler, Szabo and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 21, upon which claim 24 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

cross-referencing the mode bias schema in a schema database to determine the grammar that is associated with the mode bias schema (C.35.line 11- C.36.line 5-searching through the mode bias schema for a grammar through the mode bias schema is interpreted as cross-referencing, C.35.lines 11-30, in the schema database indicates/points the/to grammar that is associated with the mode bias schema).

As per **claim 25**, Yamakita, Haley, Butler, Szabo and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 24, upon which claim 25 depends. Yamakita further discloses:

sending the grammar to an input engine comprises retrieving the grammar from a grammar database (C.35.lines 21-31-grammar is retrieved from the format type dictionary grammar database) and sending the grammar to the input engine (C.36.lines 11-36).

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakita (US Patent No. 5,956,681) in view of Haley (US 6,950,831), and further in view of Fortescue.

As per **claim 20**, Yamakita discloses a computer system for applying mode bias to an input field of an electronic document of an application, the system comprising:

a schema registry connected to the application (Fig. 10-registration table, Fig. 1 item 108, C.16.lines 22-28-application, C.35.lines 62-64), wherein the schema registry operable to point to code for dynamically generating a plurality of grammars (C.35.lines 43-64-his format type field generation as for dynamically generating grammars, and the format type is located in the schema registry-Fig. 10, which points to code for “E-mail”, C.9.lines 49-53-his control program, and C.35.lines 62-64-his coping with various schema) comprising one of: regular expressions and statistical language models (C.35 line 11-C.37 line 36-his explicitly defined grammar and description of a text string for his appropriate field as his regular expression, wherein the grammar defines, for a speech input, numbers and format for a Fax field, for example), wherein the plurality of grammars are used to define an appropriate input for the input field, and wherein each

schema in the registry is associated with a corresponding grammar by one of: referring to the corresponding grammar directly (C.5.lines 55, 56-formatted text generation section determines acceptable grammar associated with the schema name, “destination number” directly, Yamakita explicitly teaches wherein the one or more grammars are used to identify an input method-direct association, , C.10.lines 1-60, his determination processing, C.8.lines 13-15, and Fig. 4, the ranked list of mode bias schema, in order, from item 401, 405, 406, 407, 409, each is listed in order, all comprising mode bias schema, and non-concurrent, which comprises by inherent order, first, second, third, etc. interpreted as their ranking by order); and

an input engine in communication with the schema registry (Fig. 1 item 101-the mobile terminal comprising the input engine is connected to the schema registry, Fig. 10-the registration table, located within Fig. 1 item 108), wherein the schema registry receives a schema name from the application through a text service framework (C.5.lines 45-67-“destination number”, “text”, “e-mail”, Fig. 1 item 108, 101-C.1.line 63-C.2.line 8-stochastic input text interfaced with mobile terminal as his text service framework and application), locates an identifier of a grammar among the

plurality of grammars (C.36.lines 1-5-his plurality of grammar types) associated with the schema name and sends the located identifier of the grammar to the input engine, wherein the input engine is at least one of the following: a speech recognition engine (C.5.lines 55, 56-formatted text generation section determines acceptable grammar associated with the schema name, "destination number", which is sent to the input engine, C.6.lines 7-19, C.35.lines 62-64, C.36.lines 30-36-the identifier of a grammar is sent to the input engine, in order for the text to be input in a predetermined text format, Fig. 1 item 117-his speech recognition), wherein the input engine uses at least one of the plurality of grammars to bias input from a user of the application toward a correctly formatted input, wherein if the input engine determines that the input of the user does not match an appropriate input, then the input engine recommends an alternate input (C.5 lines 45-67-his input and correction/alternate input based on grammar file, see claim 1 grammar discussion, and abstract, "The contents of the recognition result are automatically determined and shaped into text data of a format type designated…"),

a recognizer library in communication with the application, wherein the recognizer library is configured to apply a semantic category to the

textual input (C.5 lines 45-67-his designated fax/email with respect to speech recognition, wherein fax/email is taken as the semantic category).

Yamakita lacks teaching the schema registry as a mark-up language schema registry. However, Haley teaches having a mark-up language schema registry (Fig. 4, his binding table, C.6-line 39-C.7 line 64-his data item as XSL). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Yamakita with Haley, providing the benefit of an document syntax registry, such as the well known XML registry, wherein XML (XSL, XQL) is a well known mark-up language which provides data structuring rules.

The above combinations lack teaching wherein at least one of the plurality of grammars comprises a union of data from a plurality of user data sources.

However, Fortescue teaches wherein at least one of the plurality of grammars comprises a union of data from a plurality of user data sources (C.8 lines 6-15-his “fax (this & mouse!click) to (him & mouse!click)-wherein his fax rules include a grammar, and the grammar comprises a union of data from a speech source and mouse source).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Szabo and Butler, Haley and Yamakita with Fortescue, providing the benefit of having a multimodal rule/grammar defining user input from more than one user data source (Fortescue, C.7 line 67-C.8 line 5).

6. Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakita in view Szabo in view of Butler in view of Haley in view of Fortescue, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of De La Huerga (US Patent No. 6,434,567).

Yamakita, Butler, Haley, Szabo, Fortescue and De La Huerga are analogous art in that they involve text input schema for structured text.

As per **claim 14**, Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 14 depends but the above combination lacks the grammar defines an appropriate input for the input field by defining a list of acceptable inputs for the input field.

However, De La Huerga teaches having a grammar define an appropriate input for a field by defining a list of acceptable inputs for the input field (C.10.lines 7-17). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the

combination of Fortescue, Szabo, Butler and Yamakita by including in a predetermined field grammar rule a list of acceptable inputs for the input field. The motivation for doing so would have been to account for various input patterns (De La Huerga, C.10.lines 15-17).

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakita in view of Szabo, in view of Butler in view of Haley, in view of Fortescue, as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of De La Huerga (US Patent No. 5,895,461).

Yamakita, Szabo, Butler, Haley, Fortescue and De La Huerga are analogous art in that they involve text input schema for structured text.

As per **claim 18**, Yamakita, Szabo, Haley, Butler and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 17, upon which claim 18 depends. Yamakita further discloses if the input engine determines that the input of the user does not match an appropriate input, then the input engine rejects the input (C.35.lines 32-47, C.36.lines 6-36-for appropriate input, unnecessary words are deleted for appropriate input into fields), but the above combination lacks causing the application to display an error message to the user.

However, De La Huerga teaches display an error message to the user if an input does not match an appropriate input (C.6.lines 50-55). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Haley, Szabo, Butler and Yamakita by indicated an error message for improper information entry. The motivation for doing so would have been to alert the user of error in an input for a specified format field (De La Huerga, C.6.lines 51-55).

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakita in view of Haley, in view of Butler in view of Szabo, in view of Fortescue, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of De La Huerga (US Patent No. 5,895,461).

As per **claim 23**, Yamakita, Haley, Butler, Szabo and Fortescue make obvious all of the limitations of claim 22, upon which claim 23 depends.

The above combination lacks if the text received at the insertion point does not match the input type defined by the grammar, then displaying an error message.

However, De La Huerga teaches display an error message to the user if an input does not match an appropriate input (C.6.lines 50-55). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Fortescue, Butler Haley, Szabo and Yamakita with De La Huerga by indicated an error message for improper information entry. The motivation for doing so would have been to alert the user of error in an input for a specified format field (De La Huerga, C.6.lines 51-55).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAMONT M. SPOONER whose telephone number is (571)272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571/272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lms
12/19/08
/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626